

**REMARKS**

Re-examination and consideration of the application are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the Examiner interview conducted on September 9, 2005. While no agreements were reached, the discussion provided great clarity as to the Examiner's position.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-6 and 12-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 12 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 12.

**Objection to the Specification**

The specification has been objected to for failing to place a reference numeral (263) behind "Java server page rules". At the suggestion of the Examiner, the disclosure has been amended to include the aforementioned reference numeral. No new subject matter has been added by way of this amendment. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

**Claim Amendments**

Claims 1 and 12 have been amended to include the limitation "wherein the version of the Java server page is accessed using a hierarchy of Java server page rules and is created by a web page author modifying an existing Java server page, and wherein the hierarchy of Java server page rule specifies the version of the Java server page to transmit to the client based on a device type associated with the client" as discussed during the Examiner interview on September 9, 2005. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, on page 17, lines 9 – 23 and page 19 lines 28 – page 20 line 14. Applicants assert no new subject matter has been added by way of these claim amendments.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-6 and 12-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0078960 (“Murren”), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0084120 (“Egli”) and Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). To the extent this rejection still applies to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant’s disclosure. See MPEP section 706.02(j).

The present invention as recited in the amended claims relates to a client requesting address book functions. Versions of Java server page are created for different device types by a web page author modifying an existing version of Java server page. Accordingly, when a request is received from a client for a Java server page, a hierarchy of Java server page rules which correlates the device type of the client with the version of Java server page is accessed. The correct version is then transmitted to the client.

During the Examiner Interview, the Examiner stated that Murren suggests using a hierarchy of Java server page rules, wherein the hierarchy of Java server page rules specifies the version of the Java server page to transmit to the client based on a device type associated with the client. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Rather, Murren teaches having a single version of Java server page that is modified during the request from the client. Specifically, Murren separates the business logic layer with the web application from the presentation layer that defines the look and feel of the web application. More specifically, Murren states, “by separating presentation aspects from the request processing, the architecture enables the application selectively renders output based

on the types of receiving devices without having the modify the logic source code at the business logic layer for each new device” (See, e.g., Murren paragraph 0061). Thus, Murren teaches a method whereby a *single* version of web page is rendered based on the client device type using the presentation layer. As shown above, Murren explicitly states that the source code is not modified for the different device types. Accordingly, Murren does not have several versions of Java Server Pages in which the source code is modified by a web page author for the specific device type. Because there is only a single version of Java Server Page in Murren, there would be no reason for Murren to use a hierarchy of Java server page rules that correlates the device type of the client with the version of Java server page is accessed. Thus, Murren fails to teach or suggest accessing a version of the Java server page using a hierarchy of Java server page rules, wherein the hierarchy of Java server page rule specifies the version of the Java server page to transmit to the client based on a device type associated with the client, and wherein the version of Java server page is created by a web page author modifying an existing Java server page.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to specifically show where Murren suggests using a hierarchy of Java server page rules to specifies the version of the Java server page to transmit to the client based on a device type associated with the client, and wherein the version of Java server page is created by a web page author modifying an existing Java server page as recited in the amended claim.

Further, Egli does not teach that which Murren lacks. Specifically, Egli does not even teach or suggest having different types of client devices much less versions of Java server pages for the different types of client devices which are created by modifying existing Java server pages. Accordingly, Egli cannot teach correlating versions of Java server pages with the client device using a hierarchy of Java server page rules.

Further, the AAPA does not teach that which Murren and Egli lack. Specifically, the AAPA is completely silent with respect to versions of Java server pages and Java server page rules. Therefore the AAPA cannot teach accessing a version of the Java server page using a hierarchy of Java server page rules, wherein the hierarchy of Java server page rule specifies the version of the Java server page to transmit to the client based on a device type associated with the client, and

wherein the version of Java server page is created by a web page author modifying an existing Java server page.


In view of the above, it is clear Murren, Egli and the AAPA, whether considered together or separately, fail to support the rejection of amended independent claims 1 and 12. Dependent claims 2-6 and 13-17, which depend, directly or indirectly on claim 1 or 12, are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/419001).

Dated: October 11, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Robert P. Lord  
Registration No.: 46,479  
OSHA • LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
*Attorney for Applicants*

## Marked-up version of replacement paragraph:

--To facilitate compatibility with WML and WAP enabled portable handheld devices such as cellphones, wirelessly connected PDAs, palmtop computer systems, and the like, embodiments of the present invention can implement client aware rendering wherein the information is formatted and sized specifically for the smaller display sizes of portable devices. This functionality involves the step of detecting the particular type of client device requesting the information (performed by the detection component 261) and rendering the information specifically for that type of client (performed by component 262). The information provided by components 262-262 are then used to access a hierarchy of Java server page rules 263 that specify, for example, which versions of pages are served to particular versions of clients (*e.g.*, types of cellphones, PDAs, types of displays, color vs. black and white, etc.). A resulting page is then selected from the page classes 210 and served to client 104. --